

II. REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed June 14, 2005, wherein: (1) Claims 1, 5, 8-10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,891,297 (POLIAK et al.), and, (2) claims 2-4, , 7 and 11 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter, but they were rejected for technical reasons as depending from a rejected base claim.

By the present amendment, applicant has: (1) amended claims 1-12 to remove the reference numbers added to them during the PCT examination phase of this application; and (2) presented arguments in support of patentability of the claims. Entry of this amendment and reconsideration of this application are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has rejected the claims based upon POLIAK et al. Asserting that each and every element recited in independent claim is shown or inherent in POLIAK et al. Applicants respectfully disagree and will explain to follow how POLIAK et al. Does not anticipate the claims of the application.

The Examiner has failed to appreciate certain claim language of claim 1, particularly, the language that calls for the cam to have a body portion that is “rotatably mounted” in the housing and that movement of the screw rotates the cam into and out of pressing engagement with the wires. Rather, in POLIAK et al., the cam is the angled surface 43 on the insert. Although the insert 40 has a central opening to receive a portion of the actuating screw 37,38, it is “keyed” to keep it from any rotation and restrain it to only axial movement. It has guides 28-30 that “also function to prevent rotation of the insert” and its cam surfaces. (Col. 4/6-9.)

The Examiner has chosen to equate the leaf spring 44 of POLIAK et al. to the cams claimed in claim 1. This is incorrect for even these leaf springs do not rotate. Rather they are “rockably mounted in the body” (Col. 4/28-31.) and movement of the inert 40 forces the free ends of these spring “outwardly into contact with the wires. (Col. 5/41-45.)

Still further, there is no mention in POLIAK et al. of the functional drag language of claim 1. Hence there can be no anticipation of the claims by POLIAK et al. and the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested.

A favorable response is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

MOLEX INCORPORATED

Date: Aug 18, 2005

By: Thomas D. Paulius
Thomas D. Paulius
Registration No. 30,792

2222 Wellington Court
Lisle, Illinois 60532
Tel.: (630) 527-4897
Fax.: (630) 416-4962